

Relations between

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
and **THE METHODIST CHURCH**

Being the Schedule attached to the Report
of the Joint Committees of the Convocations
of Canterbury and York.

stcott House

E

293
REL



5540147995

E ~~unclassified~~
293 REL

RELATIONS BETWEEN
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND
THE METHODIST CHURCH

Being the Schedule
attached to the Report
of the Joint Committees
of the Convocations
of Canterbury and
York

WESTCOTT HOUSE
THE CHASE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE



8EFLH

088 634 094

1965

Published for the Convocations
of Canterbury and York by the
Church Information Office,
Church House, Westminster, S.W.1

LIST OF MEMBERS

CANTERBURY

The Bishop of London (Dr R. W. Stopford, *Chairman*)

The Bishop of Winchester (Dr F. S. Allison)

The Bishop of Bristol (Dr O. S. Tomkins)

The Bishop of Oxford (Dr H. J. Carpenter)

The Dean of Windsor (Very Revd R. W. Woods)

Canon E. W. Kemp, D.D.

Canon E. A. Newman,

The Revd S. R. Day, D.PHIL.

The Revd R. P. P. Johnston

The Revd E. C. Bailey*

The Revd E. D. Cartwright

The Revd H. Riley (*Secretary*)

LAY ASSESSORS

The Earl of March

M. McQueen, Esq.

O. W. H. Clark, Esq.

M. Chandler, Esq.

YORK

The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd F. J. Taylor, *Chairman*)

The Bishop of Liverpool (Dr C. A. Martin)

The Archdeacon of Manchester (Ven. S. Bean)

The Dean of Carlisle (Very Revd L. du Toit)

The Archdeacon of Doncaster (Ven. P. G. Bostock)

The Archdeacon of Pontefract (Rt Revd E. Treacy)

Canon B. A. Smith

Canon W. Wallis

The Revd P. H. Boulton

The Revd C. R. Butlin*

Canon H. R. Wilson (*Secretary*)

LAY ASSESSORS

Dr J. V. Loach

Mrs Hoskyns-Abraham

*Resigned on ceasing to be a member of Convocation.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

In the May Sessions of the Convocations in 1963, the following resolutions were passed (with slight verbal differences in the York version¹). Together they form the terms of reference of the Joint Committees of the Convocations.

That His Grace the President be respectfully asked to invite their Lordships of the Upper House to ascertain by the end of July 1964 the opinion of the clergy and laity of the dioceses on the proposals contained in the Report.

[This date was subsequently changed to 31st December 1964]

That His Grace the President be respectfully asked to arrange for a Joint Committee of the Convocation, with power to consult with any similar Joint Committee of the Convocation of York [*in York, Canterbury*], to receive replies sent in from the dioceses and to report at the Sessions of May 1965.

We have had five combined Sessions of the two Joint Committees, and we have been greatly helped by the presence of the lay assessors appointed to represent the House of Laity of the Church Assembly. Though the lay assessors could not constitutionally be members of Convocation Committees, they have taken a full part in all the discussions.

We have given a wide interpretation to the instruction 'to receive the replies from the dioceses', in the belief that the Convocations would welcome comments on the replies and recommendations for action in the light of them. Our main purpose has been to suggest what is the general mind of the dioceses and what steps should be taken on the evidence available of what the Church desires. We have therefore commented on a number of questions and we have suggested that there has been misunderstanding of what some of the proposals in the *Report of the Conversations* really involve. We have been aware that many problems relating to Stage 2 have been raised by the dioceses, but we think that they can only be answered through the processes of joint discussion with the Methodist Church which we recommend.

¹ Printed in the York Convocation Report No. 554.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER ANGLICAN PROVINCES AND THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH

A further resolution of both Convocations asked:

That His Grace the President be respectfully asked to communicate the contents of this Report (*sc. Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church*) to the Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion, and to the authorities of the Old Catholic Church, and to invite their comments on the proposals contained therein.

This Their Graces accordingly did, but replies were received only from the Church in Wales, the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Old Catholic Church. Their Graces have communicated the replies to us; we have considered them and report as follows:—

(a) The Church in Wales

The Archbishop of Wales reported that a joint panel of eighteen representatives of the Church in Wales and eighteen from the Methodist Church in Wales had been meeting to consider *The Report of the Conversations* and that the papers submitted to and accepted by the joint panel were being published.¹ The Archbishop has said that questions are being sent out to Welsh dioceses which follow in general the line of those sent to the dioceses in England. It was hoped that the Governing Body of the Church in Wales would consider the replies in September 1965.

(b) The Scottish Episcopal Church

The following statement was issued by the Provincial Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1964.

The Scottish Episcopal Church welcomes the Anglican/Methodist Report as a substantial achievement in our common quest for Unity. We consider that certain points need further discussion, and a possibly greater measure of agreement than at present exists before Stage 1 can be entered into. These points are:

- The place of Confirmation
- The form and matter of the Eucharist
- The wording of the proposed Ordinal
- Marriage discipline
- Methodist relations of Intercommunion with non-Episcopal churches.

Subject to this qualification we consider that the proposals in the Report are generally acceptable, and would be ready to proceed to Stage 1.

¹ See *Anglican-Methodist Union in Wales*, published by the Church in Wales 1965.

(c) Other Anglican Provinces

The fact that no other Anglican Province has found it necessary to comment on the proposals suggests that they do not feel any particular anxiety about their relationships with a possible United Church. Moreover it should be noted that most of the Provinces are themselves engaged in comparable discussions.

(d) The Old Catholic Church

In response to the Archbishops' request for comments the Old Catholic Bishops sent a Memorandum which is printed in full in Appendix A.

At the request of the Joint Committees the Archbishop of Canterbury appointed one of their members to visit Holland and discuss the Memorandum with the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishop of Deventer. In the course of this discussion the following points became clear:

1. The Old Catholics would wish their comments on the general shape of the Anglican-Methodist discussions to be qualified by their lack of acquaintance with Methodism and with its standing as a world-wide Communion.

2. There are two matters about which the Old Catholics are most concerned.

- (a) They are anxious that when the United Church is formed the Church of England shall carry into it all the essentials of Catholic faith and order which the Bonn Agreement recognises it as now possessing.

- (b) They share the misgivings expressed by some Anglicans that the Methodist Church does not accept and understand the office of priest as it has been known and possessed in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church from the beginning, and this raises in their minds doubts about the intention of Methodist ministers who take part in the Service of Reconciliation. It is clear that the Old Catholics, like many others, would be much helped on this point if common forms of Ordination were drawn up and used by both Churches from the inauguration of Stage 1.

3. In spite of his misgivings about certain features of the scheme the Archbishop of Utrecht was emphatic that he would not regard the implementing of it as a reason for breaking communion with the Church of England, though of course the Old Catholic Churches would not necessarily regard themselves as involved in any new relationship to the Methodists.

4. The Old Catholics attach great importance to the views of the Orthodox Churches on these matters and the Archbishop of Utrecht hopes that Orthodox opinion on the Service of Reconciliation may be sought.

5. It seems most important that during the period in which any negotiating committee is sitting there should be theological discussion about the scheme between Anglicans and Old Catholics, for it is plain that Churches which are of a different language and cultural tradition from our own cannot properly be expected to comment on important documents such as the Anglican-Methodist Report without some opportunity for verbal explanation and discussion.

3

ANALYSIS OF DIOCESAN REPORTS

We have considered in detail all the reports from the dioceses. There was a wide variation in the methods used by the dioceses to obtain the views of the clergy and laity. Some took a vote in the Diocesan Conference, the majority did not. Some recorded voting in Ruridecanal Chapters and Conferences; and others reported only a general impression. A few recorded votes by parishes. Nor were all the dioceses asked to consider precisely the same questions. Some gave no figures which we were able to use in relation to certain questions.

The method used to reduce these figures to some common basis and the detailed digest of the findings are described in Appendix B. (The figures given below relate to the diocesan averages of affirmative voting as explained in the Appendix).

We have taken as the basis of our general assessment of the opinion of the dioceses the five questions which, with some minor modifications, were used by the majority of the dioceses.

1. (a) *Do you believe that visible unity is part of God's will?*
- (b) *Do you believe that the coming together of Anglicans and Methodists in one Church is a natural and logical step towards such union?*

In the voting on 1(a), all but one of the average votes were over 75%. On 1(b) there were 38 diocesan votes 35 of which were over 75%.

1 (a)	<i>Affirmative Votes</i>	<i>Canterbury</i>	<i>York</i>	<i>Total</i>
	100—75%	22	11	33
	74—66%	1	—	1
	65—50%	—	—	—
	below 50%	—	—	—
1 (b)	<i>Affirmative Votes</i>	<i>Canterbury</i>	<i>York</i>	<i>Total</i>
	100—75%	24	11	35
	74—66%	—	1	1
	65—50%	1	—	1
	below 50%	1	—	1

2. *Do you believe that the Report on the Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church and the proposed reconciliation of the two Churches and the Ministries offers in broad outline the way forward?*

To this question there were replies from 28 dioceses in the Province of Canterbury and from 13 dioceses in the Province of York.

<i>Affirmative Votes</i>	<i>Canterbury</i>	<i>York</i>	<i>Total</i>
100—75%	15	4	19
74—66%	2	4	6
65—50%	5	3	8
below 50%	6	2	8

3. *Do you think that further discussion between the two Churches is necessary for the clarification of outstanding issues before the implementation of Stage 1?*

There were replies from 23 dioceses in the Province of Canterbury and from 11 dioceses in the Province of York.

<i>Affirmative Votes</i>	<i>Canterbury</i>	<i>York</i>	<i>Total</i>
100—75%	9	4	13
74—66%	5	2	7
65—50%	5	5	10
below 50%	4	—	4

4. *Do you think that we can expect the answer to the many questions concerning Stage 2 to become plain as we seek God's will during the period of full communion?*

There were replies from 17 dioceses in the Province of Canterbury and 8 dioceses in the Province of York.

<i>Affirmative Votes</i>	<i>Canterbury</i>	<i>York</i>	<i>Total</i>
100—75%	10	—	10
74—66%	3	1	4
65—50%	3	3	6
below 50%	1	4	5

5. *Mention concisely any points you specifically wish to be brought to the attention of Convocation.*

With 8 exceptions the dioceses sent lists of points which it was considered needed clarification. These lists coincided on many points and we have been able to state these in a more factual manner in the Appendix B. It will be noted that 34 out of 35 dioceses expressed varying degrees of concern about the Service of Reconciliation; 32 out of 35 asked that the place of Confirmation in Stage 1 should be considered; 29 out of 35 were anxious about Marriage Discipline; 23 out of 35 were concerned about the use of Unfermented Wine, and that 21 out of 35 raised questions concerning the Establishment.

We therefore conclude that there is a real desire in the dioceses for union with the Methodist Church. Consideration of the voting on Question 2 leads us to the conclusion that a clear majority believes that the *Report* offers in broad outline the way forward, but when this voting is compared with that on Question 3 and the list on Question 5 it is equally clear that the Church as a whole is not ready to proceed without a period of consideration in a Joint Negotiating Committee with the Methodist Church.

THE OPINION OF THE HOUSE OF LAITY

The House of Laity met in separate session on Friday February 19th 1965 and passed the following resolutions:

That this House, believing that Christian Unity is God's will for his Church welcomes the Report *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church* and considers that the scheme contained in it offers in broad outline the way forward to union between the Churches.

Voting: *For*: 128. *Against*: 28.

That before any decision is taken to inaugurate Stage 1 of the proposals the House of Laity would welcome the establishment of a joint Anglican/Methodist consultative body to consider the problems and to clarify the doubts to which attention has been drawn in this House and by other Anglican and Methodist bodies.

Voting: *For*: 140. *Against*: 17.

That this House generally approves the proposed Service of Reconciliation.

Voting: *For*: 93. *Against*: 31.

That this House recognises the reasonableness in principle of the continuation during Stage 1 of the relations of intercommunion now existing between the Methodist Church and other non-Anglican Churches.

Voting: *For*: 83. *Against*: 15.

THE QUESTION OF AMBIGUITY

Because in many diocesan reports there are references to the 'ambiguity' or 'lack of precision' or even 'equivocation and evasion' of the proposals, we think that it is important to deal with this matter in some detail. These expressions and the judgements or apprehensions which they voice sometimes refer to the Service of Reconciliation, and this will be dealt with later. Sometimes, however, they refer to Stage 2 of the proposals and sometimes

more generally to the contents of the *Report of the Conversations* relating to the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments.

In our view, there is in this *Report* an important distinction in this respect between Stages 1 and 2. When a United Church is formed, it will clearly be necessary to make some agreed statement about its faith and order. This statement might consist of a new formulation or it might confirm some or all of the formulations existing in the two Churches. Important as this question will be when Stage 2 approaches, it would not be necessary or practicable to settle it before entering on Stage 1. During Stage 1 each Church will retain its own formulations, order and forms of worship, except in so far as it may decide to revise them by any of its normal procedures, and except, as regards the Methodist Church, that it will now accept the historic ministry of bishops, as having theological significance and pastoral value, and take it fully into its life.

This does indeed raise the question whether the two Churches already hold in common a sufficient area of belief to form a basis for full communion. This question is discussed in the second chapter of the Interim Statement, and the final *Report* has proceeded on the assumption that the two Churches share sufficient common ground in the field of faith to make full communion possible.

Some reports have urged that more precise formulations of faith regarding the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments ought to be part of the agreement to enter on Stage 1. We think that a fully representative body of Anglicans would not find it at all easy to commit themselves as a body to anything on these topics which went beyond our existing official formularies, and these are few, and, as is well known, interpreted with considerable freedom. We could not impose on others more precision than is agreed among ourselves. This applies, for example, to suggestions that more definition of the nature of episcopacy and priesthood is needed, or, as one diocesan report suggests, that we ought to state the ways in which priesthood is shared by the Church corporately, by the ordained ministry and by the lay people. The terms of the Bonn Agreement with the Old Catholic Churches imply that where two parties are agreed in recognising each other as holding the essentials of the Catholic faith it is not necessary to draw up new formulations of faith as a pre-condition to entering on the state of full communion. In our judgement it is unnecessary and undesirable to depart from that precedent in our relations with the Methodists.

We recognise that within the Church of England uniformity of practice in certain basic respects laid down by law or rubric provides a fixed framework within which differences of theological emphasis are held together, particularly in regard to the Church, Ministry and Sacraments (cf. *Report*, page 48). In some at least of these respects it will be necessary to have a definite understanding with the Methodist Church as to future practice, e.g. as to episcopal ordination, (where we recommend that an Ordinal for use in both Churches should be drawn up), and the restriction of the celebration of the Eucharist to ordained ministers. Beyond certain agreed points of uniform practice, of which these are instances, it does not seem that the Church of England can ask for more precision in formulation and definition, without going beyond the demands which it makes upon its own members. This, besides being an indefensible attitude towards the Methodist Church, might well give rise to divisions among ourselves.

6

THE SERVICE OF RECONCILIATION¹

The Service of Reconciliation has been widely criticised on the ground of its 'ambiguity', and in particular because it appears not to be clear whether it constitutes an ordination or not in that part of it which concerns the ministers of the two Churches. It is essential to realise that the Service of Reconciliation is designed to effect the reconciliation of the Churches as corporate bodies. This is carried out through representative persons, ministerial and lay. The reconciliation of the ministries is to be seen in this context, and is intended to involve all the ministers, so far as may be, of both Churches.

In liturgical worship there must often be room for diversity of interpretation as to the manner in which God answers the prayers of the Church, (for example, how he gives his presence to us in Holy Communion). Agreement in the language of common

¹ The Revd R. P. P. Johnston dissociates himself from this section. See separate note on page 22.

prayer may and sometimes does cover considerable differences of understanding of the purpose of that prayer. We accept this whenever, as in Ordination, we ask for God's grace in a matter about which there is theological diversity of interpretation. Even if this openness towards the mystery of divine action is called 'ambiguity', it is necessary because of our human limitations. But it is compatible with quite precise and definite petition to God to grant gifts which he has declared his willingness to give, whether in Baptism, Eucharist, order of Ministry, or any other of his gifts for the building up of the Body of Christ.

The words and acts of the Service of Reconciliation must be understood in the light of the Declaration of Intention (page 38) and with a close attention to the words actually used in it. The aim is the integration of the two ministries so that each can 'enter into that which (God) has given to the other', and 'to assure to our united Churches a ministry fully accredited in the eyes of all their members, and so far as may be, of the Church throughout the world.'

The Service of Reconciliation proceeds on the assumption that 'neither of us wishes to call in question the reality and spiritual effectiveness of the ministry of the other Church' but it also assumes that each ministry represents and embodies a distinctive heritage which could be given to and received by the other. In this way the Service of Reconciliation seeks to achieve the full integration of the two ministries.

Most of the suggestions of 'ambiguity' concern the part of the Service in which Methodist ministers are received by the Anglican bishop and clergy. There is no ambiguity about the prayer (page 42), which asks God to renew his blessings already given to those over whom the prayer is said, and to pour out the Holy Spirit upon them 'to endue each according to his need with grace for the office of a priest in the Church of God'. This prayer, followed by the silent laying-on of hands on each minister is undoubtedly sufficient in form and matter for an ordination, if God requires it. The prayer is explicit and can be made with the same certainty of an effectual response as a similar solemn prayer at an ordination service.

However, in this Service of Reconciliation there is no attempt to define the relation of one ministry to the other or to pronounce on the question whether the action which God will take in response

to our prayer will be of the nature of an outright ordination or not. That issue is deliberately placed in God's hands with the conviction that he will, by such action as he sees fit, bring about the desired end, as the prayer has stated it. There is an unknown factor here, namely the exact mode of divine response to the prayer which God will see to be needed. This ignorance on our part is explicitly admitted before God in the words of the prayer ('each according to his need'). But there is no 'ambiguity' of petition, purpose or intention. We pray that what the one ministry has received from God will be given to and received by the other. Receptiveness is the key word for the approach to this service. Negative statements about its character would be contrary to this spirit; the declaration that the Service is or is not an ordination would prejudge an issue which is uncertain and is much more properly left in God's hands. We must, however, add that it appears to us that any attempt to weaken the language of the prayer on page 42 of the *Report*, or to replace it by one that is less explicit, would arouse more opposition to the Service than at present exists.

Similarly we believe that the Anglican bishops and clergy can come to the prayer and laying-on of hands by the Presiding Methodist Minister with a ready and willing receptiveness. The solemn prayer and act provide an appropriate way by which the special character of the Methodist ministry may be given to and received by the Anglicans. We acknowledge that the Methodist Church has stood for a distinctive tradition of spirituality and devotion from which we wish no longer to be isolated. The Methodist ministry represents and embodies this tradition, and further, whatever may be ultimately true of its relation to the traditional ministry of priesthood, it has its own authority and quality as a ministry manifestly blessed and used by God. By entering into this part of the Service the Anglicans express their desire to share in the special character of the Methodist ministry, and through prayer and the laying-on of hands the Methodists solemnly commit their own heritage of ministry to their Anglican brethren. This would seem to be the appropriate way for achieving such a deep and fundamental unity and fellowship in ministry as is to be desired for the movement into full communion.

It is our view that each participant can come to this Service of Reconciliation without denying any gift of ministry which he believes he has already been given, but with a complete readiness to

receive whatever God may will to give him for the high purpose of unity and fellowship in one ministry with his brethren in the other Church. We are satisfied that Anglican clergymen taking part in this service can honestly come to it with the willingness and expectation that they will receive renewal and enhancement of their ministry in the Church of God and thenceforward be fully enabled to share in the ministry of Word and Sacraments in the Methodist Church. Similarly the Methodist ministers will receive such renewal and enhancement of their ministry as they may, in God's eyes, need for the office of priest in the Church of God and thenceforward be fully enabled to share in the ministry of Word and Sacraments in the Church of England.

There is in our judgement no ambiguity about the purpose or outcome of this service and it appears to us to secure completely the very desirable end of the integration of the two ministries from the start.

7

CONFIRMATION

Anxiety has been expressed in the replies from the Dioceses about the place of Confirmation during Stage 1. It is feared, not least among the laity, that admission to Holy Communion of members of the Methodist Church who have not received episcopal Confirmation might lead to the decline of Confirmation among Anglicans.

These fears are understandable, but it may well be that episcopal Confirmation will increasingly establish itself among Methodists during Stage 1, and become normal in the United Church as a thoroughly biblical element in Christian initiation. We are encouraged in this hope by evidence of the growing use of episcopal Confirmation in the Church of South India, and by the fact that within Methodism itself the practice has grown in recent years whereby it is the Chairman of the District who receives new members, and that in many Methodist Churches new members are received into full membership through the laying-on of hands rather than by the right hand of fellowship.

Throughout Christendom, both Catholic and Reformed, the theology and practice of Christian initiation is under critical examination. For this reason it would be inappropriate to insist on a rigid following of traditional Anglican practice by the Methodist Church during Stage 1. But in the light of the replies from the dioceses we recommend that, without prejudice to the long term consideration of the association in liturgical practice of Baptism, Confirmation and first Communion the immediate problem be referred to the Joint Negotiating Committee which we propose. We hope that this Committee would consider the possibility of producing a common form of service for use in both Churches during Stage 1, in which would be combined the Anglican tradition of episcopal laying-on of hands, together with the strong elements of committal to personal discipleship to be found in the Methodist Order of Service for the Public Reception of New Members.

8

LEGAL QUESTIONS

The procedure proposed to be used at the inauguration of Stage 1 in the achievement of closer relations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church, including the Service of Reconciliation and the consecration of Methodist bishops, is bound to involve many legal problems for both Churches. New legislation will be required to give effect to the deliberate decisions of the two Churches notwithstanding any existing provisions of the ecclesiastical law, that is the law governing the Church of England, and of the law governing the Methodist Church found mainly in the Methodist Church Union Act 1929 and the trust deeds governing Methodist churches and property. Such legislation will have to be enacted by Act of Parliament and not by Church Assembly Measure, since it will be required to apply as well to the Methodist Church as to the Church of England and to cover the reciprocal arrangements to make possible full intercommunion. The advantages of a single piece of legislation are not far to seek. The legal changes necessary can be set out in a comprehensive Act and as far as possible both Churches can be treated as equal partners in the process. Any

attempt to draft the legislation required would be premature at this moment, but it is probable that the proposed Act would require six main clauses on the following lines.

1. A clause authorising the Service of Reconciliation

This clause would provide that, notwithstanding any Act, Measure, instrument or law relating to the Church of England or the Methodist Church, it should be lawful for bishops and others of the clergy of the Church of England and ministers of the Methodist Church, and members of both Churches, to take part in the Service of Reconciliation. The final form of this might be annexed to the Act as a schedule.

2. A clause authorising the consecration of Methodist bishops

This clause would provide that, notwithstanding any Act, Measure, instrument or law relating to the appointment or consecration of bishops, it should be lawful for the Methodist Conference to choose ministers of the Methodist Church for consecration as bishops of that Church. Also for bishops of the Church of England to take part in the consecration of such persons and in due course for Methodist bishops and bishops of the Church of England to use a form of service other than that in the existing Ordinal.

3. A clause authorising the matters involved at Stage 1

This clause would provide that, notwithstanding any Act, Measure, instrument or law relating to the Church of England or the Methodist Church or any instrument or trust affecting the churches or property of either Church, it should be lawful, after a specified date, for bishops and others of the clergy of the Church of England and bishops and ministers of the Methodist Church, who take part in the Service of Reconciliation, and bishops and ministers of either Church who are consecrated or ordained at or after the beginning of Stage 1, to officiate in services held in churches of the other Church, and to use in those churches and in churches of their own Church the forms of service in use by either Church. The effect of this on provisions of the Marriage Act 1949 would have to be detailed.

4. A clause excepting Methodists from liability to ecclesiastical law and other consequences

This clause would provide that neither the Service of Reconciliation nor episcopal ordination or consecration should make a Methodist minister or bishop subject to ecclesiastical law or to the jurisdiction of any ecclesiastical court or any Anglican diocesan bishop, nor should consecration by a Methodist bishop make a Methodist church subject to the consequences attaching under ecclesiastical law to an Anglican church consecrated by an Anglican bishop. This clause would also provide that the Clerical Subscription Act 1865 should not apply to a Methodist minister, whether in connection with his participation in the Service of Reconciliation or his episcopal ordination or any other occasion.

5. A clause preserving the existing civil status of Methodist ministers

This clause would provide that the status under the general law of a Methodist minister or bishop should not be affected by the Service of Reconciliation, or episcopal ordination or consecration, or officiating in Anglican services, and in particular that he should not be disqualified from membership of the House of Commons, and that the creation of Methodist bishops was not to affect the number of Lords Spiritual or make any Methodist bishop *ex officio* eligible for a seat in the House of Lords.

6. A clause dealing with a minister's relinquishment of Office

This clause would provide that when a minister of either Church relinquishes his office in his own Church, he will automatically relinquish his ministry in the other Church.

PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION¹

The general conclusion which we have drawn from the reports of the dioceses is that there is strong evidence of a widespread desire in the Church to find a way to union with the Methodists, although there is no clear mandate in them which would justify our recommending to the Convocations that the proposals in the *Report of the Conversations* should be accepted without elucidation and amplification.

There seem to be three possible courses of action open to the Church:

1. To reject the proposals of the *Report of the Conversations* and to inform the Methodist Church that the Church of England is not yet ready for any steps towards union with them. We judge that in the reports of the dioceses there is no justification for this extreme action.
2. To reopen the Conversations on the basis of some means of reconciling the Churches and the Ministries other than on the lines of a Service of Reconciliation such as that contained in the *Report of the Conversations*. We note that 7 dioceses report a desire among some of the laity and clergy that some alternative procedure should be followed. We understand that those engaged in the Conversations gave very careful consideration to the possibility of using the Church of South India method of bringing the Churches together, and came to the conclusion that whatever its merits in the Indian situation it was unworkable in the situation in Britain. We call attention to the arguments on pp. 40-41 of the *Interim Statement* against a method, similar in principle, to that used by the Church of South India, by which the Methodist Church would accept episcopacy and lay down a rule that all future ordinations of Methodist ministers would be episcopal, but without any act of unification of existing ministries at the start. This might well mean that full communion between the Church of England and the Methodist Church would not be achieved for fifty years, during which period there would be two classes of Methodist ministers each in a different relation to the Church of England. The resulting

¹ See separate note of the Revd R. P. P. Johnston.

confusion in the very many local situations where Anglican and Methodist churches exist close to each other would be intolerable. Anomalies which might be tolerable for a limited period because organic union had been accepted as the final goal could not be justified for the sake of gaining a complex inter-relationship which might last for half a century.

It has also been suggested that the main difficulties experienced by many members of the Church of England who are doubtful about the method proposed in the *Report of the Conversations* would be removed if the clergy and ministers of the two Churches each received ordination by the usual method of ordination of the other Church. We do not consider that this suggestion is practicable. It would not be acceptable to many Methodists who would regard it as calling in question the reality of their Ministry and requiring them to repudiate their spiritual history (see *Report of the Conversations* p. 25). It would not be acceptable to many Anglicans, who would regard it as implying that their own orders were in some way incomplete.

It has also been suggested in one diocesan report that all that is needed to make full communion possible would be that the two Churches should recognise each other's ministries just as they are. We believe that this would not lead to the organic union which we are convinced must be our goal; that it would not be widely accepted in the Church of England; and would have disastrous consequences for the relations of the Church of England with the rest of the Anglican Communion and with the other episcopal Churches.

3. To go forward as proposed in the *Report of the Conversations*. This we believe to be the method which commands the greatest support in the Church of England. The essential points in the proposals are:—

(a) the acceptance of organic union as the goal to be achieved in two stages: a first stage during which the Church of England and the Methodist Church would remain distinct but in full communion with each other, and a second stage of organic union;

(b) the reconciliation of the two Churches at the beginning of Stage 1, in a service which includes the integration of the existing ministries;

(c) the acceptance by the Methodist Church of episcopacy in continuity with the historic episcopate and the unfailing practice of episcopal ordination for its ministers thereafter.

We also consider that in principle the Service of Reconciliation proposed in the *Report of the Conversations* (pp. 37-47) embodies the only practicable method of reconciling the Churches and of unifying the two ministries at the outset. We have dealt in Section 6 with the objections that this Service is ambiguous and imprecise and that the status of Methodist ministers after the Service of Reconciliation would be obscure. We believe that these objections are unfounded, and that the Service, properly understood, will result in the ministry of both Churches being fully accredited in the eyes of all their members and, so far as may be, of the Church throughout the world. Further discussion may improve details of the Service of Reconciliation, but in our judgement the basic principles of the Service must be retained if full communion is to be achieved in Stage 1.

Nevertheless it is clear that the Church of England is not yet ready to accept the proposals contained in the *Report* without further discussions, which will clarify points on which doubt exists, and deal with a number of questions which the *Report of the Conversations* did not consider fully. In particular the question of the future nature of the relation of Church and State must in our judgement be considered in principle with the Methodists before Stage 1, though the form of any necessary changes in the Establishment can be determined during that Stage. We consider that in the reports from the dioceses, re-inforced by the voting in the House of Laity, there is ample justification for the Convocations to affirm their desire for full communion and eventual union with the Methodist Church and to enter into negotiations with the Methodist Church on the basis of the proposals in the *Report of the Conversations*.

We recommend therefore that the Methodist Church be invited to co-operate in setting up a Joint Negotiating Committee as soon as possible.

The Joint Negotiating Committee would:—

- (1) examine such questions of doctrine, discipline and procedure as need clarification before Stage 1 can be initiated. These questions will include the main issues raised in the reports from the dioceses (see page 37).
- (2) recommend the final form of the Service of Reconciliation and arrange for the preparation of an Ordinal to be used in both Churches from the beginning of Stage 1.

- (3) arrange for the preparation of such draft legislation as may be necessary (see Section 8).
- (4) consider how far the problems which will arise in Stage 2, including especially the question of the Establishment can and should be clarified before Stage 1 is entered.
- (5) have power to ask for the appointment of such other Joint Committees as may be needed to advise on particular issues.

The Negotiating Committee would in due course report to the two Churches, and it would be at that point that the decision whether or not to seek full communion and eventual union with the Methodist Church would be made. Without detailed study together by Anglicans and Methodists there can be no way forward. We are convinced that the Church as a whole desires to find a way forward; we therefore recommend without hesitation to the Conventions that they should ask for a Joint Negotiating Committee to be set up.

The work of the Joint Negotiating Committee will be exacting. We think that its final report should be submitted to the Churches not later than December 1968. If the Committee's suggestions are accepted and the two Churches decide to go forward to Stage 1 with the purpose of entering into Stage 2, it might be possible for the reconciliation of the two Churches to take place in 1970.

We suggest that such a Joint Negotiating Committee should not be too large. We suggest that it should be composed of 12 members of the Church of England and 12 members of the Methodist Church in England. The Church in Wales and the Scottish Episcopal Church are affected by the proposals to a degree much greater than any other part of the Anglican Communion, because the authority of the Methodist Conference in England also extends to Wales and Scotland and because of the continual interchange of people between the three countries. In view of the special problems of Scotland and Wales we suggest further that the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church in Wales should be invited to send representatives and that these should be matched by an equal number of Methodists from Scotland and Wales, if they so desire.

JOINT COMMITTEES OF THE CONVOCATIONS RESOLUTIONS

1. That this Report be received.
2. That this Convocation, believing on the evidence of their reports that the dioceses generally regard the coming together of Anglicans and Methodists in one united Church as a natural step towards the visible unity of Christendom, affirms its desire for full communion and eventual union with the Methodist Church.
3. That this Convocation considers that the reports from the dioceses do not constitute a mandate for unqualified acceptance of the proposals in the precise form embodied in the Report of the *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church*, but believes nevertheless that the reports disclose sufficient support for the main proposals to enable the Church of England to enter into negotiations with the Methodist Church on the basis of

(a) the reconciliation of the two Churches in a service which includes the integration of the two ministries;

(b) the acceptance by the Methodist Church of episcopacy in continuity with the historic episcopate and the invariable practice of episcopal ordination for its ministers in the future;

(c) a first stage during which the Church of England and the Methodist Church remain distinct but are in full communion with each other, to be followed by a second stage involving the organic union of the Churches.

4. That this Convocation, noting the many points of concern in the reports from the dioceses, request His Grace the President, in consultation with His Grace the President of the Convocation of York/Canterbury, and with the appropriate authority in the Methodist Church, to set up a Joint Negotiating Committee, which shall

(a) examine such questions of doctrine, discipline and procedure as need clarification before Stage 1 can be initiated;

(b) recommend the final form of the Service of Reconciliation, and arrange for the preparation of an Ordinal to be used in both Churches from the beginning of Stage 1;

(c) arrange for the preparation of such draft legislation as may be necessary to enable Stage 1 to be initiated;

(d) consider how far the problems which will arise in Stage 2, including

especially the question of the Establishment, can and should be clarified before Stage 1 is entered.

(e) have power to ask for the appointment of such other joint committees as may be needed to advise on particular issues.

5. That this Convocation respectfully suggest that this Committee should include twelve members of the Church of England, and His Grace the President, in consultation with the President of York/Canterbury be requested (a) to ask the Church in Wales and the Scottish Episcopal Church if they so desire, each to be represented and (b) to ask the Methodist Church similarly to appoint an equal number of members to serve on the Committee.
6. That this Convocation respectfully request His Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House to devise means by which in the meantime closer relations between Methodists and Anglicans may continue to be fostered in work and worship.
7. That the Joint Committee be discharged.

ROBERT LONDIN: *Chairman*
FALKNER WINTON:
OLIVER BRISTOL
HARRY OXON:

JOHN SHEFFIELD, *Chairman*
CLIFFORD LIVERPOOL

E. D. CARTWRIGHT
S. R. DAY
E. W. KEMP
E. A. NEWMAN
HAROLD RILEY
R. W. WOODS

ERIC PONTEFRAC
A. S. BEAN
P. G. BOSTOCK
P. H. BOULTON
B. A. SMITH
LIONEL DU TOIT
WILLIAM WALLIS

A NOTE BY THE REVD R. P. JOHNSTON

I am in general agreement with sections 1-5, 7 and 8 of the Report. It rightly stresses what has already been achieved, and the widespread desire throughout the dioceses for the coming together of Anglicans and Methodists. It is also obviously correct to say that 'the way forward proposed in the *Report of the Conversations* is the one which commands the greatest support in the Church of England'. But it must be remembered that in eight dioceses the majority were against this way forward, and in thirty-four dioceses specific doubts were expressed concerning the Service of Reconciliation.

I find myself unable to accept the explanation of the Service of Reconciliation contained in Section 6 of the Report. Consequently I cannot subscribe to the Section 9, 'Proposed Course of Action' as it stands. I would, however, fully support the recommendation 'that the Methodist Church be invited to co-operate in setting up a Joint Negotiating Committee as soon as possible'.

The existence of a hard core of conscientious dissent regarding the present proposals must not be ignored. The fact that they are acceptable to the majority is not in itself sufficient reason for their approval. It would not be right to prefer a course of action which a minority could not join to one which was universally acceptable, even if this former appeared quicker and simpler to administer than the latter.

There are grave practical difficulties about these proposals which should not be ignored:—

(a) This method of bringing Churches together would be largely unacceptable to other Free Churches. If we are to take seriously the challenge issued from Nottingham to the member Churches of the British Council of Churches to achieve organic union by Easter, 1980, then this is particularly relevant.

(b) The Reconciliation rite cannot be a once-for-all affair, but will have to be repeated for each new entrant from overseas into the united ministry. In the case of union with another Church, all would have to take part in it again. The tendency will surely be for it to become less and less meaningful.

But these pragmatic objections are not nearly so serious as the doctrinal principles involved. A substantial body of Anglicans (and also of Methodists) cannot conscientiously give approval to the Service of Reconciliation for the following reasons:—

(1) The doctrine of priesthood which underlies the *Report*, and which is

implicit in the Service of Reconciliation, is one which cannot be justified from the New Testament or supported from the formularies of the Church of England.

- (2) The practical principle assumed regarding episcopacy appears to be that there can be no official intercommunion or full communion with non-episcopal Churches. None is envisaged with the Methodist Church prior to the Service of Reconciliation. A scheme cannot be accepted which assumes this principle, or as a precedent commits the Church of England to it for the foreseeable future. Moreover, in view of the Methodist Conference resolutions of 1964, it appears that if the Church of England adheres to this principle, then organic union (Stage 2) will never be possible.
- (3) The Service of Reconciliation is rightly said to be 'sufficient in form and matter' for the ordination of Methodist ministers (p. 10). This is in itself a ground of objection. It is inconsistent with the view of the Anglican Memorandum of 1923 in which the signatories stated that they found it 'impossible to regard as invalid' the ministries of the Free Churches. To say that we are ignorant before God as to how he will answer our prayer in this connection is really to say that we are ignorant as to the present status before God of Methodist ministers. But we believe them to be already valid ministers of the Word and Sacraments, and so cannot pretend to be ignorant on this point. To take part in a Service which deliberately allows for the conveying of 'episcopal ordination' as distinct from 'episcopal authorisation' to Methodist ministers would be intolerable to many consciences.

It has been suggested that the Service of Reconciliation might be revised in such a way as to accommodate the views of those who at present cannot accept it. This is not possible. The Service is so carefully balanced that any shift of emphasis, either to make it more clearly only an authorisation of Methodist ministers, or alternatively, to show it to be an episcopal ordination, would at once make it totally unacceptable to large sections in one or other of our two Churches.

In the light of these considerations, if we are to walk together an alternative way forward must be found. There should be at least further consideration of the Church of South India and the Nigerian Scheme as requested by some dioceses. That such an alternative may appear to be less convenient and more testing of our charity and patience should not be regarded as a decisive objection. It is surely better to strain charity than to wound consciences and risk dividing Churches. I therefore submit that the terms of reference to be given to the proposed Joint Negotiating Committee should be

widened. This may be done by means of the following amendments. The effect of these will be, not to exclude the Service of Reconciliation from their survey, but to allow them to consider alternative ways forward as well.

Amendments to Resolutions:—

3. Delete the words 'disclose . . . to enable' and substitute 'give warrant to'.

Omit clause (a); (b) will then become (a) and (c) become (b).

4. (b). Delete words 'the final form . . . Reconciliation' and substitute 'a method of entry into Stage 1 which shall have the fullest possible support in both Churches'.

(d). After 'Establishment' add 'and relations with non-episcopal Churches'.

5. After clause (b) add (c) 'and to ask the Methodist Church to consider inviting observers from the Free Churches'.

R.P.P.J.

APPENDIX A

Memorandum of the International Old Catholic Bishops' Conference

The International Old Catholic Bishops' Conference (IBC) welcomes with great joy and gratitude every effort to closer relations and reunion of the Christian Churches, whether the latter wish to be considered solely as of early Christian origin, or place themselves in the category of a kind of 'reformation', which has taken place during the course of church-history, while considering their ties with Christian antiquity as not having been interrupted.

The IBC also sees the negotiations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church in England, laid down in the *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church*, as such an effort, which 'Conversations' culminate in a proposal for the unification of the two Churches by way of two stages, introduced by a 'Service of Reconciliation'.

The IBC admits that its knowledge of the Methodist Church in England is solely based on what has been set forth in the Report of the Conversations. On these grounds the IBC finds that Methodism was at first a revival movement within the boundaries of the Church of England, which however afterwards broke away from her and proceeded to set up its own congregations. Though Methodism, according to its principles of a free revival movement, did not in itself have a need for a church order including well defined ministries and ordinations, it has nevertheless accepted and developed them, but entirely after its own free conception, which wished to contrast clearly with the conception of the Church of England as to that and which wished to bear a lasting character of not being essential and not exclusive with regard to the individual believer.

In the view of the Catholic Church outside England, who considers and acknowledges the Church of England to be the genuine Catholic Church on this island, representing there the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ and his Apostles, the movement of Methodism might be seen as a schism *within* the Church of England. This means that according to the view of the Catholic Church outside England, the schism would be removed as soon as the Church of England and the Methodist fellowship, originating from it should have found a way by which the breach was overbridged and healed and unity was restored by the coming-back of the aberrated Methodist brothers into the mother-church.

It appears, however, that the Church of England does not wish to see the Church of the Methodists as being in schism, but as a sister Church of equal merit, closely related with her and with whom she therefore wishes to arrive at a relationship of intercommunion or full communion and on the strength of that subsequently to corporate unity.

Here now, however, the differences occur that have at one time led to the breach and that have consolidated and widened that breach since then. The object of the present 'Conversations' is to clear away these differences or to somehow neutralise them in a mutual accommodating spirit.

If the IBC has so far understood the intentions and purposes of the 'Conversations' and the procedures proposed in them correctly, then it would first of all like to recall the Bonn Agreement of 1931, which in such a felicitous way settles the relations between Anglicans and Old Catholics. The IBC still regards as its essential point the recognition of each other's catholicity, out of which results the complete *communio in sacramentis*.

When now, moreover, two Churches become one and thus also the 'independency', still in existence between Anglicans and Old Catholics, disappears there, an organic unity becomes necessary, which among other things will have to reveal itself in one structure of church-order.

Here now lies the 'crux' of the cause for the IBC. Church-order is not merely a form of ecclesiastical organisation, but it is a heritage of old, rooted in the Church's doctrine. It will be clear that here the question of episcopacy and of the priesthood presents itself and is at stake. The IBC finds indeed that this is being confirmed by the many contradictory views that have made themselves known since the publication of the 'Conversations'. In this the IBC is most strongly impressed by the observations of 'A Dissident View', published by a minority of the Methodist Commission. Though the IBC does not in the least agree with these views, they give it a clear insight into the fact that the Conversations have not or at least not yet reached the level on which these essentially dissenting views should be overcome and cleared away. These essential differences are therefore *still* in existence and are being carried along in a stronger or lesser degree in the efforts and steps to reunion.

This is quite clear to the IBC from the 'Service of Reconciliation' in which, it is true, with honest piety and faith and with prudent

wisdom, an inner reunion is left to God, but in which and after which the certainty about the 'Unity of the Spirit' (Eph. 4:3) is not established without doubt.

The IBC bases its opinion about this lasting uncertainty and with that its doubts about the sufficiency of the 'Service of Reconciliation' on the following points:

(a) There is no agreement with regard to the meaning, the value and the contents of the priesthood.

(b) There is no agreement with regard to the absolute necessity, the indispensability of 'episcopacy' as a form of church-structure.

(c) There is, consciously and purposely, no unanimity in the answer to the question as to what is the office of a bishop in the Universal Church of God, that is in the 'Una, Sancta, Catholica et Apostolica'.

The IBC recalls that on the Old Catholic side the orders of the Anglican Church were in former times acknowledged as real, authentic and valid, as sound and fully catholic on the ground of the certainty that the apostolic succession has really been preserved and that the ordinations/consecrations take place with the laying-on of hands to impart the grace, the power and the commission of the ministry under the invocation of the Holy Spirit. In other words at every ordination and consecration that which the apostles and their successors meant and did from the very first, takes place. And furthermore that the episcopate can never exist in itself but that it is part and parcel of all the principles that together account for the catholicity of the Church.

The IBC considers, with the Church of the first fifteen centuries, the Episcopate (in its unity with presbyterate and diaconate) as being of divine right, as much as Holy Scripture, the *regula fidei* and the sacraments, and therefore as a live function of the church and of its catholicity. Thus anchored in the divine founding-will and in the being of the church, the Episcopate is necessary and indispensable for the continuation of the Church. Therefore the IBC deems the acceptance of the ministry of the Church in its three-fold form *and* in the sense in which the Church has generally known and recognised it since the second century, as strictly necessary to unity as the acceptance of the Scriptures as *prima regula fidei*, of the symbols of the early Church and of the sacraments. It is this decision that has to be accepted and not some later interpretation of 'episcopacy', which as a more or less isolated form of church-government may or may not be 'taken into the system'.

In the *manus impositio* of the 'Service of Reconciliation' the IBC does not see a conclusive guarantee, because here it is only supposed that, by the imposition of hands from the one side, God will grant to the other side what it 'might' be lacking, while this deficiency is unsufficiently described and recognised. It is therefore possible that the laying-on of hands, performed from the Anglican side, on the one hand may be seen as an ordination to the priesthood, but it leaves the possibility for the receiving Methodist to be convinced that in "his" ministry he already possessed and possesses this priesthood and that in the laying-on of hands he only receives the authority to exercise 'his' priesthood or ministry in the other Church as well. On the other hand it remains completely obscure to the IBC what an imposition of hands, performed by Methodists to an Anglican minister, be it bishop or priest, could possibly give. It won't do to consider gifts of prophetic or dynamic power and spirituality as sole privileges of the Methodist ministry. Also, according to the New Testament, the office of prophet is never translated by the laying-on of hands but is always understood as directly given by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, in this case the laying-on of hands can mean nothing more than a legitimation, a form of conferring jurisdiction and authority.

In this connection the IBC does not deem it right to lay things into the hand of God as long as both sides are not perfectly at one as to the contents and the purpose of what is asked for in prayer and what is meant to be defined and effectuated by their own sacral act in praying thus.

The IBC is convinced that there are more points that could be mentioned as undecided questions but wishes to leave it at this.

In concluding it would like to express the thought that the Conversations may not yet be called completed in the sense that every ambiguity would be removed and that therefore a procedure as proposed in the 'Service of Reconciliation' cannot lead to the much desired unity.

The IBC considers a decision in the matter at this stage of the Conversations also premature in that it would build up a serious obstruction in the way of the negotiations that are being carried on with the Orthodox by both Anglicans and Old Catholics.

APPENDIX B

DIGEST OF DIOCESAN REPORTS

Because of the variety of methods used in the dioceses to assess opinion, it has not been at all easy to produce accurate figures. The variations were such that the only method which could be adopted was to reduce the voting figures to percentages of those voting Yes out of those who voted. This has been done under five main categories (see below). Such figures cannot be regarded as entirely satisfactory. In some cases the Bishop has simply reported a general impression. In order to obtain some comparative figures it has been important to reduce these to some kind of percentage figure. Where this is done, such phrases as 'a substantial majority' is interpreted as a 75% vote and other figures related to this (e.g. the phrase 'almost unanimous' in the Blackburn report is rated at 80%). All such figures are marked with an asterisk.

It has not been possible to reduce all the diocesan reports in this way, some did not ask the same questions and some did not take any votes.

It should be noted that figures for larger groupings (e.g. Ruri-decanal Conferences) where no individual voting figures are given are less accurate than those where they are recorded.

Under the category 'Clergy' the figures given in brackets are those of Chapters and not individual votes.

Some dioceses have answered Questions 1(a) and 1(b) together and in these cases the same figures are given twice.

Rural Deaneries (RD). Some dioceses voted in Ruri-decanal Conferences and these figures are on these headings.

Parishes (P). In some dioceses the parish was the unit which was consulted and this often took the form of the votes of the Parochial Church Councils.

Dioceses (D). A vote was sometimes taken at a Diocesan Conference and votes from deaneries or parishes collated into a diocesan figure.

Clergy (C). Sometimes the clergy were consulted in Ruri-decanal Conferences or Chapters or they voted separately at diocesan meetings.

Laity (L). Sometimes the laity vote was separated in the same way as the clergy vote.

1(a) *Do you believe that visible unity is a part of God's will?*

CANTERBURY							YORK						
	RD	P	D	C	L	Av		RD	P	D	C	L	Av
1 Canterbury	—	—	—	—	—	—	30 York	—	—	—	(100)	89	94
2 London	64	—	—	—	—	64	31 Durham	—	78	—	99	—	88
3 Winchester	85*	—	—	—	—	85	32 Blackburn	—	—	—	—	—	—
4 Bath & W.	75*	—	—	—	—	75	33 Bradford	—	—	96	—	—	96
5 Birmingham	—	99	—	—	—	99	34 Carlisle	—	—	—	90	88	89
6 Bristol	—	—	76	—	—	76	35 Chester	—	—	—	—	—	—
7 Chelmsford	—	—	—	95	93	94	36 L'pool	94	98	—	95	88	91
8 Chichester	79	—	—	—	—	79	37 Manch'r	—	—	—	98	97	97
9 Coventry	94	—	91	89	92	91	38 N'castle	—	100	—	74	—	87
10 Derby	—	—	—	—	—	—	39 Ripon	—	—	—	—	—	—
11 Ely	—	—	—	—	—	—	40 Sheffield	—	—	98	—	—	98
12 Exeter	—	—	—	—	—	—	41 S & Man	—	—	100	—	—	100
13 Gloucester	—	—	—	99	100	99	42 Southwell	93	—	—	85	—	89
14 Guildford	—	81	—	75	81	79	43 Wakefield	—	—	98	—	—	98
15 Hereford	89	—	—	—	—	89							
16 Leicester	75*	—	—	—	—	75							
17 Lichfield	90*	—	—	—	—	90							
18 Lincoln	72	92	—	87	—	85							
19 Norwich	93	—	—	—	—	93							
20 Oxford	75*	—	—	—	—	75							
21 Peterbro'	—	—	—	—	—	—							
22 Portsmouth	100	—	—	—	—	100							
23 Rochester	75*	—	—	—	—	75							
24 S. Albans	—	—	95*	—	—	95							
25 S. Ed. & Ip.	—	—	—	(100)	—	100							
26 Salisbury	—	—	94	93	—	93							
27 Southwark	—	—	—	98	97	97							
28 Truro	—	98	—	91	—	94							
29 Worcester	—	—	—	—	—	—							

AVERAGES			
	Canterbury	York	Total
100—75 %	22	11	33
74—66 %	1	—	1
65—50 %	—	—	—
below 50 %	—	—	—

1(b) *Do you believe that the coming together of Anglicans and Methodists in one Church is a natural and logical step towards such union?*

CANTERBURY							YORK						
	RD	P	D	C	L	Av		RD	P	D	C	L	Av
1 Canterbury	—	—	75*	—	—	75	30 York	—	—	—	(92)	89	90
2 London	46	—	—	—	—	46	31 Durham	—	71	—	85	—	78
3 Winchester	75*	—	—	—	—	75	32 Blackburn	80*	—	—	—	—	80
4 Bath & W.	75*	—	—	—	—	75	33 Bradford	—	—	96	—	—	96
5 Birmingham	—	91	—	—	—	91	34 Carlisle	—	—	—	90	88	89
6 Bristol	—	—	76	—	—	76	35 Chester	—	—	—	—	—	—
7 Chelmsford	—	—	—	80	81	80	36 L'pool	94	98	—	95	88	93
8 Chichester	79	—	—	—	—	79	37 Manch'r	—	—	—	87	90	88
9 Coventry	94	—	91	89	92	91	38 N'castle	—	100	—	74	—	87
10 Derby	—	—	—	—	—	—	39 Ripon	—	—	—	—	—	—
11 Ely	—	—	—	—	—	—	40 Sheffield	—	—	98	—	—	98
12 Exeter	95	—	—	94	—	94	41 S & Man	—	—	100	—	—	100
13 Gloucester	—	—	—	99	100	99	42 Southwell	93	—	—	85*	—	89
14 Guildford	—	81	—	75	81	79	43 Wakefield	—	—	74	66	82	74
15 Hereford	89	—	92	—	—	90							
16 Leicester	75*	—	—	—	—	75							
17 Lichfield	90*	—	—	—	—	90							
18 Lincoln	72	92	—	87	—	85							
19 Norwich	93	—	—	—	—	93							
20 Oxford	75*	—	—	—	—	75							
21 Peterbro'	—	—	—	—	—	—							
22 Portsmouth	100	—	—	—	—	100							
23 Rochester	75*	—	—	—	—	75							
24 S. Albans	—	—	95*	—	—	95							
25 S. Ed. & Ip.	—	—	—	92	—	92							
26 Salisbury	—	—	94	93	—	93							
27 Southwark	—	—	—	90	89	89							
28 Truro	—	71	—	38	—	54							
29 Worcester	—	81	—	—	—	81							

AVERAGES			
	Canterbury	York	Total
100—75%	24	11	35
74—66%	—	1	1
65—50%	1	—	1
below 50%	1	—	1

2 *Do you believe the Report on The Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church and the proposed reconciliation of the two Churches and the Ministries offers in broad outline the way forward?*

CANTERBURY							YORK						
	RD	P	D	C	L	Av		RD	P	D	C	L	Av
1 Canterbury	—	—	60*	—	—	60	30 York	—	—	—	(52)	66	59
2 London	14	—	—	—	—	14	31 Durham	—	75	—	84	—	79
3 Winchester	75*	—	—	—	—	75	32 Blackburn	70*	—	67	—	—	68
4 Bath & W.	70*	—	—	—	—	70	33 Bradford	—	—	57	56	—	56
5 Birmingham	—	83	—	—	—	83	34 Carlisle	—	—	—	33	51	42
6 Bristol	—	—	76	—	—	76	35 Chester	—	51	—	30	45	42
7 Chelmsford	—	—	—	65	62	63	36 L'pool	68	75	—	64	64	67
8 Chichester	76	—	—	—	—	76	37 Manch'r	—	77	—	67	78	74
9 Coventry	82	—	83	79	84	82	38 N'castle	—	91	—	85	—	88
10 Derby	—	—	—	—	—	—	39 Ripon	—	—	—	—	—	—
11 Ely	—	36	—	26	—	31	40 Sheffield	—	—	74	—	—	74
12 Exeter	38	—	—	(50)	—	44	41 S & Man	—	—	96	—	—	96
13 Gloucester	—	—	—	87	95	91	42 Southwell	80	—	—	94	—	87
14 Guildford	—	81	—	75	81	75	43 Wakefield	—	—	62	55	72	63
15 Hereford	51	—	72	—	—	61							
16 Leicester	63	—	—	—	—	63							
17 Lichfield	94	—	—	—	—	94							
18 Lincoln	56	92	—	81	—	76							
19 Norwich	48	—	—	—	—	48							
20 Oxford	94	—	—	—	—	94							
21 Peterbro'	55	41	—	(50)	—	48							
22 Portsmouth	86	—	—	—	—	86							
23 Rochester	65*	—	—	65	—	65							
24 S. Albans	—	—	98	—	—	98							
25 S. Ed. & Ip.	—	—	—	(75*)	—	75							
26 Salisbury	—	—	86	81	—	83							
27 Southwark	—	—	—	83	85	84							
28 Truro	—	37	—	36	—	36							
29 Worcester	—	66	—	—	—	66							

AVERAGES			
	Canterbury	York	Total
100—75%	15	4	19
74—66%	2	4	6
65—50%	5	3	8
below 50%	6	2	8

3 *Do you think that further discussion between the two Churches is necessary for the clarification of outstanding issues before the implementation of Stage 1?*

CANTERBURY							YORK						
	RD	P	D	C	L	Av		RD	P	D	C	L	Av
1 Canterbury	—	—	75*	—	—	75	30 York	—	—	—	54	50	52
2 London	57	—	—	—	—	57	31 Durham	—	61	—	75	—	68
3 Winchester	64	—	—	—	—	64	32 Blackburn	—	—	—	—	—	—
4 Bath & W.	75*	—	—	—	—	75	33 Bradford	—	—	—	—	—	—
5 Birmingham	—	67	—	—	—	67	34 Carlisle	—	—	—	67	38	52
6 Bristol	—	—	9.5	—	—	9.5	35 Chester	—	—	—	65	—	65
7 Chelmsford	—	—	—	70	59	64	36 L'pool	—	59	—	—	—	59
8 Chichester	79	—	—	—	—	79	37 Manch'r	—	—	—	—	—	—
9 Coventry	—	—	—	—	—	—	38 N'castle	—	64	—	52	—	58
10 Derby	—	—	—	—	—	—	39 Ripon	—	—	75*	—	—	75
11 Ely	—	45.5	—	41	—	43	40 Sheffield	—	—	96	—	—	96
12 Exeter	71	—	—	(100)	—	85	41 S & Man	—	—	91	—	—	91
13 Gloucester	—	—	—	54	11	32	42 Southwell	40	—	—	100	—	70
14 Guildford	—	—	—	—	—	—	43 Wakefield	—	—	83	85	80	82
15 Hereford	—	—	72	—	—	72							
16 Leicester	63	—	—	—	—	63							
17 Lichfield	88	—	—	—	—	88							
18 Lincoln	90	52	—	75	—	72							
19 Norwich	89	—	—	—	—	89							
20 Oxford	70*	—	—	—	—	70							
21 Peterbro'	—	—	—	—	—	—							
22 Portsmouth	71	—	—	—	—	71							
23 Rochester	—	—	—	—	—	—							
24 S. Albans	—	—	75*	—	—	75							
25 S. Ed. & Ip.	—	—	(100)	—	—	100							
26 Salisbury	—	—	61	69	—	65							
27 Southwark	—	—	—	35	63	49							
28 Truro	—	98	—	88	—	93							
29 Worcester	—	—	—	—	—	—							

AVERAGES			
	Canterbury	York	Total
100—75%	9	4	13
74—66%	5	2	7
65—50%	5	5	10
below 50%	4	—	4

- 4 *Do you think that we can expect the answer to the many questions concerning Stage 2 to become plain as we seek God's will during the period of full communion?*

CANTERBURY							YORK						
	RD	P	D	C	L	Av		RD	P	D	C	L	Av
1 Canterbury	—	—	—	—	—	—	30 York	—	—	—	33	65	49
2 London	—	—	—	—	—	—	31 Durham	—	60	—	63	—	61
3 Winchester	90*	—	—	—	—	90	32 Blackburn	—	—	—	—	—	—
4 Bath & W.	70*	—	—	—	—	70	33 Bradford	—	—	—	—	—	—
5 Birmingham	—	68	—	—	—	68	34 Carlisle	—	—	—	28	17	22
6 Bristol	—	—	76	—	—	76	35 Chester	—	—	—	—	—	—
7 Chelmsford	—	—	—	49	50	49	36 L'pool	—	—	—	—	—	—
8 Chichester	65	—	—	—	—	65	37 Manch'r	—	—	—	—	—	—
9 Coventry	—	—	—	—	—	—	38 N'castle	—	45	—	46	—	46
10 Derby	—	—	—	—	—	—	39 Ripon	—	—	—	25*	—	25
11 Ely	—	—	—	—	—	—	40 Sheffield	—	—	—	—	—	—
12 Exeter	—	38	—	(50)	—	—	41 S & Man	—	—	57	—	—	57
13 Gloucester	—	—	—	82	100	91	42 Southwell	80	—	—	67	—	73
14 Guildford	—	81	—	75	81	75	43 Wakefield	—	—	61	52	73	62
15 Hereford	—	—	—	—	—	—							
16 Leicester	—	—	—	—	—	—							
17 Lichfield	98	—	—	—	—	98							
18 Lincoln	65	80	—	80	—	75							
19 Norwich	51	—	—	—	—	51							
20 Oxford	70*	—	—	—	—	70							
21 Peterbro'	—	—	—	—	—	—							
22 Portsmouth	86	—	—	—	—	86							
23 Rochester	60*	—	—	—	—	60							
24 S. Albans	75*	—	—	—	—	75							
25 S. Ed. & Ip.	—	—	—	(75*)	—	—							
26 Salisbury	—	—	82	69	—	75							
27 Southwark	—	—	—	80	82	81							
28 Truro	—	—	—	—	—	—							
29 Worcester	—	—	—	—	—	—							

AVERAGES			
	Canterbury	York	Total
100—75 %	10	—	10
74—66 %	3	1	4
65—50 %	3	3	6
below 50 %	1	4	5

Question 5 *Mention concisely any points you specially wish to be brought to the attention of Convocation.*

These points are listed below. Although they do not contain every single item mentioned they cover everything which was raised in more than one diocesan report. The following dioceses did not mention any points for clarification:—

Bristol
 Guildford
 Hereford
 Leicester
 Southwark
 Worcester
 Bradford
 Wakefield

But it does not follow that the points listed below were not matters of concern in these dioceses. The number of dioceses raising an issue is given after each item.

Service of Reconciliation

General Concern	21	}	34
Ambiguity	13		
Alternative Rite			7
Place of Laity			4
Place of Non-participants in United Church			10

Ministry

General	12
Episcopacy	10
Priesthood	11
Diaconate	16
Women	8
Lay Preachers, etc.	7
Ordination (and need for new Ordinal)	11

Sacraments

General	8
Baptism	10
Confirmation	32
Lesser Sacraments	5

Holy Communion

Unfermented Wine	23
Disposal of Consecrated Elements	19
Lay Celebration	15
Eucharistic Theology	5
Methodist 'Open Table'	12

<i>Holy Communion (continued)</i>	
Use of Individual Cups	5
Frequency of Communion	1
Intercommunion before Stage I	4
Reservation	1
<i>Moral Questions</i>	
Social Ethics	6
Marriage Discipline	29
<i>Relations with Other Churches</i>	
General	5
Anglican Communion	17
Wider Episcopal Fellowship	7
Non-Episcopal Churches	13
Roman, Orthodox and Ancient Oriental	20
Methodist Relations with other Churches	10
<i>Doctrine</i>	
Scripture and Tradition	3
Authority of Scripture	3
Creeds	2
Thirty-Nine Articles	6
The Church	3
Need for Declaration of Faith	6
<i>Worship</i>	
Uniformity	7
Prayer Book	4
Liturgical Revision	8
Ecclesiastical Calendar	2
Lectionary	1
Daily Offices	1
<i>Establishment</i>	
General	21
Patronage and Freehold	6
<i>Buildings</i>	12
<i>Schools</i>	3
<i>Joint Theological Training</i>	7
<i>Finance</i>	3
<i>Dangers of Schism</i>	7
<i>Request for More Time</i>	6
<i>Parallel Episcopate</i>	3
<i>Questions about Stage 2</i>	
General	13
Time between Stage 1 and Stage 2	4

The Main Concerns (raised by 15 or more dioceses) therefore are:—

1. Service of Reconciliation (34)
2. Confirmation (32)
3. Marriage Discipline (29)
4. Use of Unfermented Wine (23)
5. Establishment (21)
6. Relations with Roman and Orthodox Churches (20)
7. Disposal of Consecrated Elements (18)
8. Relations with the Anglican Communion (17)
9. The Diaconate (16)
10. Lay Celebration (15)

PRINTED IN ENGLAND *by* WIGHTMAN MOUNTAIN LTD.
WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.1



1965

CHURCH INFORMATION OFFICE

Price 2/6